REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Amendments

Claims 1, 7, 8, 14, 15 and 16 have been amended. No new matter has been added by these amendments.

Claims 1, 8, 15 and 16 are amended to change all references in the claims to "display" to --electronic display-- as required by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §112.

The limitations of paragraphs (c) and (b) of claims 1 and 8, respectively, have also been amended to specify that the ordering of the recognized concepts is done on a **dynamic basis** by including, in the preferences information of the user preferences knowledge base, **dynamic information which is learned from prior actions of the user**. In addition, as clearly indicated by the foregoing listing of claims, claims 1 and 8 have been amended to present clearer grammatical punctuation.

Dependent claims 7 and 14 have been amended to present consistent language in view of the amendments to the independent claims on which they depend.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the claim rejections by the Examiner having regard to the following submissions.

35 U.S.C. §112 Rejection

As stated, Applicants have complied with the Examiner's requirement to change all references in the claims to "display" to --electronic display -- and, therefore, it is submitted that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 has been overcome.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejection

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 4-5, 8 and 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by **Millier et al** (U.S. Patent No. 5,899,995). In response, applicants state that the present amendments to independent claims 1 and 8 clearly eliminates any basis on which to perceive an anticipation thereof by **Millier et al**. While **Millier et al** (per Fig. 2A) might be perceived to show "an" ordering of

hierarchical concept identifiers, it most certainly does not show any <u>dynamic</u> ordering of hierarchical concept identifiers according to priorities of the user determined from preferences information <u>containing dynamic information learned from prior action(s) of the user</u>. Indeed, **Millier et al** has no concern with, or any discussion whatsoever regarding, the presentation of prioritized concept identifiers, and is not directed to a method or means of any presentation at all. Instead, **Miller et al** is directed to a method and means for automatically filing information into a number of pre-profiled categories (folders), and there is nothing in **Miller et al** directed to any particular presentation of those categories. This is clear from Fig. 2A itself which simply presents a fixed (static) arrangement of folders on an alphabetical basis.

In order for this rejection to be valid, the cited reference <u>must teach every aspect of the claimed invention</u> either explicitly or impliedly and any feature not directly taught must be inherently present. This legal requirement is clearly not satisfied with respect to the amended claims and, accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is requested.

<u>35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection</u>

The Examiner has rejected claims 6-7 and 13-14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over **Millier et al** and further in view of **Hyatt** (U.S. patent No. 6,678,692). In response, applicants traverse such allegation and submit as follows.

Firstly, it is noted that the Examiner may have incorrectly construed the independent claims of this application judging from the incorrect, bolded comment of the Examiner set out below, which appears at page 3, paragraph 5 of the Report with reference to the claims and **Millier et al**:

> As in Claim 1 and 8, Millier teaches an electronic document viewer system for personalized presentation to a user of a plurality of electronic documents input from a source, said system comprising a concept recognizer component configured for recognizing concepts, themes and sub-concepts, sub-themes associated with content of documents (ref. 230 Feature Recognizer), a user preferences knowledge base comprising preferences information personal to said user (Fig. 2B, ref. 240), a prioritization analyzer component configured for ordering the recognized concepts, themes and sub-concepts, sub-themes with the documents associated therewith, according to priorities of the user determined from the preferences information (Col. 4, line 10 et seq.), a

Page 7 of 9

viewer component configured for presenting on an electronic display a first hierarchical level of multiple levels of prioritized concept identifiers interlinked according to a a hierarchical structure **based on ordering (Fig. 2A)**, wherein each concept identifier represents the documents associated therewith and a concept, theme, sub-concept, sub-theme (Col. 5) and for presenting on the display one or more in turn (Col. 6, line 10) lower hierarchical levels of the hierarchical structure of prioritized concept identifiers upon selection thereof by the user from a concept identifier presented on the display (Col.5, line 55 et seq.).

In fact, the claims do not recite just "an ordering" but instead require "presenting ... based on said ordering", and, by the amended claims, "said" ordering is the recited dynamic ordering of recognized concepts, themes, sub-concept and/or sub-themes, based on dynamic information learned from prior action(s) of the user.

Further, referring to the Examiner's allegation at page 5, in the final paragraph, regarding claims 7 and 14, that **Millier et al** "teaches a concept learner component that creates new knowledge pertaining to the user based on data sensed from the system's environment for input to a knowledge base of user data (Column 3, lines 18 et seq.)" the sum total of **Millier et al.**'s said teaching is to be found at Column 3, lines 16-34 and Column 11, line 21, all of which pertains to **Millier et al.**'s method and means for filing documents, that is, for matching an input document (information) to an existing, pre-profiled folder (category). This teaching has no relation whatsoever to applicants' method and means for presenting documents, via their viewer system, by providing a dynamically, personalized presentation to a user.

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner must meet three requirements: First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either In the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings; second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success; and thirdly, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. However, for the reasons provided above with respect to the deficient disclosure and teachings of **Millier et al.,** and the submissions below, it is clear that none of these requirements are satisfied with respect to the amended claims herein. Therefore, the Examiner is requested to withdraw this ground of rejection.

Like **Millier et al.**, the teachings of **Hyatt** are not directed to any presentation and just incidentally contemplate a static manner of presentation. And, neither **Millier et al.** nor **Hyatt**, nor any combination of them, in any way discloses the aforesaid <u>dynamic</u>, user-personalized document presentation feature of the claimed invention achieved by providing, <u>dynamic information which is learned from prior actions of the user</u>. The purpose of **Hyatt** is to provide a system for which a user can input a concept to identify the documents sought by the user rather than search for specific text in documents in a database. For a given database of records, a predominant feature i.e. "key concept", which best characterizes each record is identified and the identified key concepts are hierarchically arranged so as to be identified by a search algorithm which searches for records relevant to that input concept. Only a static system ranking of documents is utilized and no user-personalization feature at all.

Accordingly no manner of combination of the cited references can be reasonably considered to render obvious applicants' claimed invention, and withdrawal of this objection is requested.

CONCLUSIONS

For all the foregoing reasons, applicant respectfully submits that the amended claims submitted herewith are in good form for allowance and the same is requested. In the event that the Examiner cannot allow the present application for any reason, the Examiner is encouraged to contact applicants' attorney to discuss resolution of any remaining issue.

Respectfully Submitted,
Abu-Hakima, Suhayya, Dr. et al.

By: _____

Lynn S. Cassan
Registration No. 32,378
Attorney for applicants

Date: 22 December, 2005